



ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

MISSOURI PART B



2006-2007

Revision Submitted April 14, 2008

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Division of Special Education

Table of Contents

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:	4
Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.....	8
Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.	14
Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:	16
A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.	16
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.	16
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.	16
Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:	21
A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and..	
B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.	21
Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:	26
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;	26
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or	26
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.....	26
Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).	29
Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:	30
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);	30
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and	30
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	30
Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	31
Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.....	34
Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	38
Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.....	41
Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.....	44
Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.	47
Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.....	50
Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.....	51

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.....	56
Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.....	58
Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.....	60
Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.....	61
Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.	63

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The following provides overarching information pertinent to this Annual Performance Report for 2006-07.

Public reporting of data: Public reports of 2006-07 district data are posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE) website, under School Data and Statistics at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/>. The Special Education Profile is posted under the Summary Reports for each district. The public are informed of the availability of this data via a special education listserv which includes all school districts, other responsible public agencies and various parent and professional organizations.

State Improvement Grants (SIG): In 2004-05, approximately 50 districts were selected and notified that they were eligible to use SIG awards for professional development activities designed to increase performance of students with disabilities. These districts worked with Special Education Consultants located in Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDC) during the 2004-05 school year to analyze data and develop improvement plans. Forty-five districts received grants in the fall of 2005 to implement their improvement plans in elementary achievement, secondary transition, or both, and 2005-06 was the first full year for implementation of the districts' action plans. These districts received continued funding for the 2006-07 school year.

- **SIG Elementary Achievement:** During the 2006-07 school year twenty-seven districts were awarded continued SIG funds for improvement in the communication arts achievement of students with disabilities in grades K-4. Personnel in districts receiving SIG funds for improvement in communication arts achievement have participated in professional development during the 2006-2007 school year to support implementation of the following instructional intervention(s): Differentiated Instruction, Wilson Reading, Data Analysis (Victoria Bernhardt), and Co-teaching trainings, Science Research Associates (SRA) Corrective Reading training. Other trainings attended by personnel in SIG districts include Quality Eligibility Determination decision-making process, Measurable Goals, Reading First Literacy, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Curriculum-Based Measurement, Responsiveness-to-Intervention, Aimsweb, Edmark/Reading Mastery, Accelerated Reading, Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS), Positive Behavior Support, Multi-Sensory Reading Instruction (MRI), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment Materials, Reading Recovery, and Individualized Education Program (IEP) training.
- **SIG Post-Secondary Transition:** Twenty-nine districts have been awarded continued SIG funds for improvement in the post-secondary outcomes of students with disabilities. Districts receiving SIG funds for improving post-secondary outcomes have participated in the following professional development during the 2005-2006 school year for teachers to support implementation of the instructional intervention(s): Nine districts have participated in Co-teaching and Collaboration trainings and eight districts have participated in Ten Sigma transition trainings. Six districts have participated in Wilson Reading training. Other trainings attended by personnel in SIG districts include Differentiated Instruction, SRA Corrective Reading, Positive Behavior Support, Self-Determination, Measurable Goals, Life Skills, Reading 180, Transition IEP, Aims Web/Curriculum-Based Measurement, and Data Analysis training. Implementation of these programs continued throughout the 2006-07 school year. Additional use of SIG funds in districts went to consultants and coaches, work force related field trips, student incentives, tutoring, and curriculum materials.

Fourth cycle focus on State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators: DESE began the fourth five-year cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) in 2006-07. MSIP is the state's accreditation system which reviews all districts during the five years of the cycle. The Division of Special Education follows the same cycle for monitoring the implementation of special education in all responsible public agencies in the state. The MSIP process for fourth cycle is much more performance based than in the past, and likewise, the special education review in districts is also much more performance based and

places more emphasis on improving outcomes and results for students with disabilities. Most activities that are required of districts by the Division are based on the State Performance Plan indicators and whether the district met the targets established in the SPP. If a district did not meet a performance target, the district is required to develop an improvement plan that addresses the indicator not met and is also required to conduct student file reviews of compliance indicators related to the performance area not met.

Improvement plan and scoring guide: Improvement planning is used for both SIG application purposes and for district monitoring. A template for improvement plans has been developed that will function as both a grant application and a self-assessment tool for MSIP purposes. The state worked with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) for the initial development of the improvement plan and scoring rubric. The improvement plan is based on DESE's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan, and is a part of a new web-based general supervision management system (IMACS-described below) implemented in 2006-07. The improvement plan is structured to include a comprehensive needs assessment, objectives with targets and benchmarks, and strategies with action steps and impact measures. Activity reports will be required from grant districts twice yearly so that implementation and progress can be monitored. An important part of the improvement plan is a scoring guide that itemizes and prioritizes the factors that DESE will use when evaluating the improvement plans for either grant or self-assessment purposes. The scoring guide makes it clear to districts what is expected in an acceptable improvement plan. District training on the improvement planning with scoring guides began in November 2006 and continued in the fall of 2007. This training was available to all districts in the state. The intent is to strengthen the improvement planning process at the district level, in order to promote changes leading towards improved outcomes for students with disabilities. These grants were funded through SIG monies and discretionary Part B funds.

March 3, 2008 is the deadline for new grant applications that will focus on implementation of evidence-based practices within 3-tiered models. These grants will be funded through discretionary Part B funds.

Core Data and MOSIS: The DESE uses the Core Data Collection System, a web-based data collection system with interactive edits, to gather data from districts. Included in the system are several integrated screens that are used to update or enter new information. Most Special Education data are collected through screens in the Core Data System. The System gathers aggregate data from districts and the data are used for SPP Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 14.

In an effort to meet the reporting requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind legislation and reduce the data burden on local schools and districts, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is developing a student-level record system, known as Missouri Student Information System, or MOSIS. When fully implemented, MOSIS will help school districts maintain more accurate information and manage student data more efficiently.

During the 2007-08 school year, both the Core Data Collection System and the MOSIS student level submissions will be used to gather data from school districts. The redundant reporting will allow for comparisons between the two data sources. It is anticipated that the MOSIS student level submission will become the sole method of reporting data to DESE in the 2008-09 school year.

IMACS: The Division has developed a web-based general supervision management system, called IMACS – Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System. IMACS was first used by districts during the 2006-07 school year and data from the system will be used to address SPP Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15. The components of the system include improvement planning, compliance file reviews, corrective action plans, disproportionality and discipline reviews, and additional data collection capacity for SPP indicators not already collected through DESE's Core Data collection system. IMACS is used by districts to submit required information to the Division for either the cyclical review process or for grant applications. IMACS is also available for districts to use on a voluntary basis so that improvement planning, implementation and evaluation can be on-going procedures for the district, and districts can conduct compliance file reviews at any time to self-monitor compliance with state and federal requirements.

Focused Monitoring Onsite Reviews: Missouri has continued to refine the focused monitoring onsite process based on its experience with pilot focused monitoring in 2004-05 and 2005-06 and its work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM). In 2006-07, ten

districts were selected for focused monitoring on-site reviews based upon data demonstrating a significant need for improvement in either post secondary transition (graduation and/or dropout rates) or elementary achievement (performance on the Missouri Assessment Program). In order to provide the maximum degree of focus before, during and after the visit, districts were selected for review in only one of these two areas, even if there were concerns in both. Data analysis and hypotheses by DESE staff and Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Consultants occurred prior to the review, and the reviews included individual and group interviews of special and regular education staff, parents, and students, file reviews and classroom observations. Districts were required to complete improvement plans and/or corrective action plans, as appropriate based upon the findings from the on-site review. The Division's focused monitoring process resembles the process being used for the fourth cycle of MSIP which began with the 2006-2007 school year. The MSIP and the special education reviews, which are aligned with and compliment each other, are combined when districts are chosen for both reviews.

Consultants: DESE contracts with nine Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs) across the state to provide training and technical assistance to districts. The Division of Special Education supports the following consultant positions:

- Improvement Consultants facilitate school improvement by helping to develop and implement data based school improvement plans. These consultants also participate in Reading First training opportunities and collaborate with other RPDC staff to improve reading performance of students with disabilities across all grade levels in Reading First and non-Reading First schools
- Regional Technical Assistance Coaches (RTACs) align, coordinate, and deliver professional development through training staff and in-district trainers and provide on-going coaching related to implementing school improvement plans. (These job duties were combined with those of Improvement Consultants, and the Coaches were converted to Improvement Consultants in 2007-08)
- Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for PBS implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor district PBS coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support districts in implementation of PBS
- Compliance Consultants work with districts to understand compliance requirements, conduct self-reviews, and write and implement corrective action plans
- Blindness Skills Specialists consult with public schools in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted
- Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for PLC implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor building/district PLC coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support buildings/districts in implementation of PLC

Throughout the remainder of the document, these personnel at the RPDCs will collectively be called "RPDC consultants" or "consultants."

MO Resources (MORE): The DESE, in conjunction with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) has completed a web-based system called MO Resources (MORE). This system provides information on topics related to the SPP Indicators. The topics are: Academic Achievement, Dropout, Dispute Resolution, Graduation, LRE (preschool age), LRE (school age), Parent Involvement, Early Childhood Outcomes, Suspension and Expulsion, Post-secondary Transition, Early Intervening Services/Response To Intervention, and Disproportionality. Within each of the topics, information in the following areas can be accessed: Literature, Position Statement, Evidence-based Practice, FAQ, Definition, Exemplary, and Legal Issue & Court Ruling. This system was made available to school districts in October 2007 and can be located at the following web address:
<http://www.northcentralrrc.org/sppinformationsupportsystem/index.aspx>.

Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Network: The mission of Missouri School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) is to assist schools and districts in establishing and maintaining school environments where the social culture and behavioral supports needed to be an effective learning environment is in place for all students. This network is supported by a State Coordinator and seven regional consultants who provide guidance and on-going technical assistance to

districts. Future plans include the Division funding additional consultant positions covering all regions of the state. There are approximately 300 buildings in Missouri considered to be actively implementing SW-PBS that are involved with the state network. Each active building is categorized into an implementation category based on established criteria. The categories include: Preparatory, Emerging, Bronze, Silver, and Gold. Thirty-five buildings were recognized in June 2007 for having met the criteria at the Bronze, Silver or Gold levels. These buildings qualify as state demonstration sites who share data with the state as well as other schools. The PBS State Leadership is scheduled to meet in April 2008 to address scaling-up issues.

Missouri Integrated Model & State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG): Through the SPDG awarded to Missouri in July 2007, state personnel are currently working with various partners and stakeholders to develop a 3-tiered integrated model of instructional and behavioral support. This model will incorporate the essential components from successful 3-tiered systems including: Positive Behavior Supports, Professional Learning Communities, Reading First, Response to Intervention (problem solving), and High Schools that Work. Implementation of the model with approximately 12 to 15 districts will begin in the 2008-09 school year.

Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) Text-to-Speech Pilot: eMints is a national center that works to enhance education through the provision of technological professional development. This program incorporates intensive tailored professional development including in-classroom support with extensive equipment. eMints classroom equipment minimally includes: teacher laptop and workstation, Smartboard and projector, scanner, printer, and digital camera, one computer for every two students and specific software. Within eMINTS, the Division is supporting a text-to-speech pilot project using text-to-speech and voice recognition (tts/vr) software. This software assists students with print disabilities in achieving higher levels of performance on reading and writing tasks. The project provides tts/vr software and professional development to selected teachers in three school districts with 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade technology rich classrooms. eMINTS, special education, and ELL teachers participated in the pilot in 2006-07. The software is used by students on IEPs and students who are emergent and/or struggling readers. eMINTS trained professionals reinforce the technology use and provide professional development. Teachers agree the text-to-speech program benefits their students but are disappointed with the voice recognition component. This project confirms that students given the opportunity to direct their learning with technology enabling tools will quickly master the software and be able to utilize the resources within the program to benefit their individual learning styles. This grant is being expanded in the 2007-08 school year to include non-eMINTS classrooms in the pilot districts. Technical and professional support will continue to be provided by eMINTS staff as a component of the grant.

Evaluation of SPP Improvement Activities: The Division of Special Education is working with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) to develop a plan for evaluating the implementation and impact of all SPP Improvement Activities. The RRC has trained Division staff in a model for evaluating improvement activities. Using this model, division staff are presently looking at all current improvement activities and determining if they are "actionable" and "aligned" with the SPP Indicator. After submission of the 2006-07 APR, staff will be doing further analysis of all improvement activities and working with RRC staff to develop an evaluation plan to be put in place for 2007-08.

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	74.0% graduation rate for students with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

The state, with a graduation rate of 72.8%, did not meet the target established for 2006-07. See information below for details.

The targets established in the SPP were based on data that excluded the Department of Corrections (DOC), because DOC serves an adult population and does not issue diplomas. Inmates work toward earning GEDs, and therefore cannot be counted as graduates. In addition, DOC data are not included in data for all students since DOC is not considered a Local Education Agency. In the SPP, DOC data was not included in baseline data in order to best represent regular school districts' performance for use in setting targets for improvement. OSEP's response indicated that DOC data must be included in the baseline data. Targets established in the SPP were not revised as this would have artificially lowered the standard for all regular school districts in the state; however, this explains why statewide data does not meet the target established in the SPP. The second table below shows that, if DOC data were excluded, the state would be exceeding the 2006-07 target for graduation rates with a rate of 75.2%

Year	Graduation Rates					Gap (All – Spec Ed)	
	Students with Disabilities			All Students			
	Number of Graduates	Number of Graduates & Dropouts	Graduation Rate	Number of Graduates	Graduation Rate		
2004-05	6,268	9,028	69.4%	57,824	86.0%	16.6%	
2005-06	6,325	8,998	70.3%	58,436	85.8%	15.5%	
2006-07	6,694	9,192	72.8%	60,370	85.9%	13.1%	

Year	Graduation Rates excluding DOC					Gap (All – Spec Ed)	
	Students with Disabilities			All Students*			
	Number of Graduates	Number of Graduates & Dropouts	Graduation Rate	Number of Graduates	Graduation Rate		
2004-05	6,268	8,603	72.9%	57,824	86.0%	13.1%	
2005-06	6,325	8,608	73.5%	58,436	85.8%	12.3%	
2006-07	6,694	8,905	75.2%	60,370	85.9%	10.7%	

Sources: All Students data from School Data and Statistics website as of 11/28/07.

Students with Disabilities data from Screen 12 of Core Data as of 11/28/07.

* DOC does not report data for all students

Formulas:

- Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate: Number of graduates / (number of graduates + number of dropouts) x 100
- All Students Graduation Rate: (Graduates / (9-12 Cohort Dropouts + Graduates)) x 100
- Dropouts include exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Maximum Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out

Calculations for students with disabilities and all students differ due to the following:

Difference in Calculations/ Reporting	Students with Disabilities	All Students (includes students with disabilities)
Collection method	Screen 12 of Core Data by district and age	Screen 13 of Core Data by building and grade level
Exiters Reported	Students on the district's Special Education child count prior to exit during the school year	All students exiting during the school year
Graduation rate calculations	<p>(Number of graduates / (number of graduates + number of dropouts)) x 100.</p> <p>Cohort dropouts not available due to collection by age, uses total number of dropouts that school year instead.</p> <p>Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits achieved by completing regular classes, regular classes with modifications, or achieving goals and objectives on the IEPs – see detail below</p>	<p>(Graduates / (9-12 Cohort Dropouts + Graduates)) x 100</p> <p>Cohort dropouts available due to collection by grade level</p> <p>Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits achieved by completing regular classes, regular classes with modifications, or achieving goals and objectives on the IEPs – see detail below</p>
Dropout rate calculations	<p>(Number of dropouts / Total child count ages 14-21) x 100. Total dropouts include the following exit categories: Received a Certificate, Reached Max Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out. Average enrollment not collected for students with disabilities, uses 14-21 child count as of December 1 instead.</p>	<p>(Number of dropouts divided by average enrollment) x 100</p> <p>Dropout categories are the same as for students with disabilities</p> <p>Average enrollment is collected for all students.</p>

The following is excerpted from Missouri's guidelines for Graduation Requirements for Students in Missouri's Public Schools:

SPECIAL POLICY CONSIDERATION FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES UNDER IDEA

Each school district must provide a free, appropriate public education for students with disabilities until they are graduated with a regular diploma or attain the age of 21 years. Local school boards must establish policies and guidelines that ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to earn credits toward graduation in a nondiscriminatory manner and within the spirit and intent of that requirement. Provisions include:

1. Any specific graduation requirement may be waived for a disabled student if recommended by the IEP Committee.
2. Students with disabilities receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as all other students when they complete the same courses as other students.
3. Students with disabilities who complete regular courses modified as indicated in their IEPs to accommodate their disabilities will receive grades and have credit transcribed

in that same manner as students who complete the same courses without modification; however, the fact that the courses were modified may be noted on the transcripts.

4. *Students with disabilities who meet the goals and objectives of their IEPs, as measured by the evaluation procedures and criteria specified in the IEPs, will have credit transcribed in accordance with the state definition of units of credit.*
5. *All students with disabilities who meet state and local graduation requirements by taking and passing regular courses without modification; taking and passing regular courses with modification; or successfully achieving IEP goals and objectives shall be graduated and receive regular high school diplomas.*
6. *Students with disabilities who reach age 21 or otherwise terminate their education, and who have met the district's attendance requirements but who have not completed the requirements for graduation, receive a certificate of attendance.*

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

As noted above, Missouri did not meet the established target for graduation rates when considering data that includes the Department of Corrections (DOC), however, when DOC data is excluded from the calculation, the state met, and exceeded, the target. Steady progress is evident in the graduation rates over the past three years.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Collaborate with other agencies in the state in order to impact post-secondary outcomes
- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans
- Identify and support use of evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator
- Develop and disseminate curriculum on high quality transition planning
- Encourage districts to offer the GED Option program
- Disseminate training on ways to engage students in the transition planning process to ensure students are involved in meaningful activities related to their transition to post-secondary life
- Assign DSE staff person to monitor and assess district progress on secondary transition grants. Develop list of questions for use with districts to assess the impact of the grant activities
- Revise grant application process to include elements which will lead districts to implement activities that are likely to result in improvement of student performance

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Collaborate with other agencies in the state in order to impact post-secondary outcomes:

A workgroup comprised of representatives from the Divisions of Special Education, Career Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation met to discuss the definitions of "disability" and to take steps to align them if needed to ensure comparability within data collected by each. The group determined that the definitions used for IEP disability and for Section 504 disability are the same within the collections. The next step for the workgroup will be to determine what data the Division will want from the other systems in order to assess the impact of services.

This workgroup participated in the NSTTAC Capacity Building Project in Charlotte, North Carolina in May of 2007. The project targeted areas of improvement in the area of post-secondary transition. The group continues to work toward identifying and collecting data which will allow for assessment of the impact of current and future transition activities. Career education has begun to collect information which monitors students with disabilities who are participating in career education courses

The DESE, as part of their work with the University of Kansas (KU) Transition Coalition, has formed a Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT). This team is comprised of representatives of agencies within the state that impact post-secondary outcomes for Missouri students. The purpose of the MITT is to identify critical needs in the area of post-secondary transition at the state level, to share data across agencies for post-secondary transition, and to work together to create positive post-secondary outcomes,

to develop a vision for impact, to develop content training related to data from Community Resource Mapping, prioritize and create an action plan, and to assist with developing a model for scaling up and sustainability. This team was established in the summer of 2007.

Targeted Technical Assistance/Improvement Plan Implementation: See APR overview (page 4). Technical assistance and improvement plan implementation offered through the local school improvement grants are collectively described in the following overview categories: SIG; SIG Post-Secondary Transition; Improvement Plan and Scoring Guide.

Identify and Disseminate Evidence-Based Practices: A variety of resources are available, including the following:

- **MO Resources:** See APR overview (page 6) Identification and dissemination of evidence-based practices are described in the overview category labeled MO Resources (MORE).
- **Searchable Database:** The KU Transition Coalition is working with the DESE to develop a searchable website of regional community resources and information related to specific transition outcome areas. The KU Transition Coalition will populate the database by entering data about Rehabilitation Services and Centers for Independent Living. Community transition teams at the local level will identify resources available within their regions and include them in the database. The database will be searchable by zip code, district, county, topic and agency name.
- **Online Community of Practice:** The DESE in collaboration with the University of Kansas (KU) has developed a website that houses the Missouri Transition Community of Practice (CoP). This website provides an effective method for practitioners to share information, problem solve solutions, and to engage with others in their ongoing efforts in post-secondary transition planning. It identifies and provides links to evidence-based practices and provides Missouri school districts with links to the Transition Coalition online professional development modules. The KU Transition Coalition posts resources and information specific to transition as well as initiating and managing participant discussion groups around specific topical trainings. These trainings include an "Ask the Expert" format in which presentations are developed and linked to the Community of Practice. The KU Transition Coalition facilitates follow up discussion groups related to the topic. One "Ask the Expert" event occurred during the 2006-07 year. There are three events scheduled for 2007-08. The first occurred in September 2007 with additional dates in January/February 2008, and March/April 2008. The primary focus is to ensure participants receive access to evidence-based practice, technical assistance and support in a timely, low cost manner.
- **Models of Success:** The KU Transition Coalition will assist the DESE by initiating a peer-reviewed process to solicit and identify 2-3 high quality models for providing transition services within Missouri. This process began in August of 2007 and is planned to be completed by June 2008. Identified districts will be filmed by the DESE. Once filming is complete the Missouri Community of Practice will provide graphic and text information about the models in Missouri.

Curriculum on High Quality Transition Planning: Several resources relating to high quality transition planning are available and include the following:

- **Online Needs Assessment:** The DESE in conjunction with the University of Kansas (KU) provided access to the online *Quality Indicators of Exemplary Transition Programs Needs Assessment Instrument* (QI) for up to 45 schools identified by DESE as low performing schools in 2005-06. This includes schools being supported by SIG funds. This practice will be continued in 2007-08. The assessment instrument is based on research-based quality indicators in the areas of transition planning, family involvement, student involvement, curriculum and instruction, access to the general curriculum, and interagency collaboration and community services. Data collected from the QI was and will continue to be analyzed by KU. The data provided to the DESE provides both statewide and district specific needs and strengths.
- **Online Courses:** The University of Kansas (KU) Transition Coalition offered the RPDC consultants and the Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT) up to five non-credit independent study online courses leading to 30 hours of CEU credit. Enrollment utilized a "cohort"

approach. The activities and objectives of the training focused on enhancing regional and state transition practices. The short courses included:

- a. Introduction to Transition Education and Services
- b. Transition Assessment
- c. Family Involvement and Student Involvement in Transition
- d. Preparing Students for Employment and Postsecondary Education
- e. Interagency Collaboration during Transition Planning
- **Compliance and Monitoring:** The KU Transition Coalition is working with the DESE compliance section to develop a plan for training Local Education Agency staff on the use of the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center's (NSTTAC) Indicator 13 checklist. In addition, the Transition Coalition and DESE are reviewing and revising the compliance review process for post-secondary transition indicators to ensure that training provided and the compliance review process are accurate and consistent. As a part of this process "Approved" IEP examples and the redesign of the IEP Form C (Post-secondary Transition Plan) have been completed. Training for district staff on the review process and forms was held in December of 2007.
- **Training Web stream on Post-Secondary Transition Training Materials and Resources:** A training tape has been developed by the DESE for compliance issues regarding high quality transition planning. This tape was made available to districts in September of 2007 and was developed to assure consistency of information provided to districts.
- **Statewide Training:** The KU Transition Coalition is developing several forms of statewide training to assist RPDCs in providing high quality, consistent, DESE-vetted training to Missouri school districts. The Transition Coalition will adapt the current online training module *Best Practices in Transition Planning* to include Missouri specific content, information, activities and resources. It will utilize the Missouri IEP form as an example to inform compliance with Indicator 13 and will use Missouri specific links and resources as appropriate. This training will be available in March of 2008. In addition, the Transition Coalition will work with the RPDC Special Education Consultants to develop a workshop training package that can be used as a part of ongoing regional training. The Transition Coalition staff will meet with Special Education Transition Consultants quarterly to provide technical support and to solicit input into the development of materials.

GED Option Program: The Missouri Option is designed to target students who have the capabilities to complete Missouri High School Graduation Requirements, but for a variety of reasons lack the credits needed to graduate with their class and are at risk of leaving school without a high school diploma. The program specifically targets those students who are 17 years of age or older and are at least one year behind their cohort group or for other significant reasons that are identified in the local Missouri Option Program Plan. The DESE is working with the Department of Corrections to explore the possibility of using Missouri Options to assist adjudicated youth to obtain high school diplomas rather than the customary GEDs which are reported as dropouts in Core Data reporting.

Training on Student Engagement: RPDC Consultants provide training to districts using the "Teaching Self-Determination Strategies for Effective Transition" module. This self-determination training is provided to enable teachers to understand the meaning of self-determination; how to promote self-determination with students; and how to teach self-determination skills to students. Current IDEA requirements make it essential that trainers be in place to teach and promote self-determination so students can "gain more control over their lives" by playing a pivotal role in the development of their transition plans. Self-determination training is made available statewide to ensure that students are involved "in meaningful activities related to their transition to post-secondary life".

Assign DSE staff person to monitor grants: Due to changes in the grant application and award processes which only allow for the implementation of evidence-based strategies, this improvement activity has been removed from the SPP.

Revise Grant Application Process: The grant application process underwent initial revisions during the 2006-07 school year (applying to 2007 applicants). See APR overview (page 5), categories

IMACS and Improvement Planning and Scoring Guide. Further revisions will apply for districts submitting applications in spring 2008. These revisions will include: inclusion of all districts in invitation to apply; updated scoring guide with graded categories; defined improvement plan template; defined timelines including deadlines; and updated regional trainings offering presentations by Special Education Consultants as well as print resources available in hardcopy and/or on the web.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No revisions have been made to targets in the SPP. The improvement activities have been re-ordered to better reflect the state's 5-year comprehensive plan for secondary transition and additional improvement activities have been added (see below). Two improvement activities regarding data verification, accuracy and use of data have been removed since these are topics that pertain to all SPP indicators and are included with the improvement activities for SPP 20.

New Post-Secondary Transition Improvement Activities: Several activities are in process and have been added to the State Performance Plan improvement activities. These activities are part of a comprehensive five-year plan for improving outcomes and building capacity for secondary transition. This plan was developed by DESE and KU staff.

- **Transition Institute:** The DESE conducted a Secondary Transition Institute in June 2007. It included content specific presentations and sessions as well as opportunities for District Teams to meet and review needs assessment data. Districts were required to bring a team consisting of a general education and special education teacher, a counselor and an administrator. District teams left the Institute with district level actions plans for implementation. A follow up to the transition institute was held in December 2007, to discuss progress and barriers encountered in the implementation process. Future Summer Institutes will be co-sponsored by the Divisions of Career Education and Special Education.
- **Transition Outcomes Project (TOP):** The DESE contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary in the fall of 2007 to provide Transition Outcomes Project training to DESE staff, RPDC Transition Consultants and selected districts. The KU Transition Coalition will assist with the trainings and support to the RPDC staff. Baseline data will be collected through the TOP training. This training will be used to increase compliance with the Indicator 13 checklist, to support best practice and to build capacity. This process began with training in December 2007.
- **Transition Liaisons:** The Transition Liaisons will be individuals selected from each region who will assist in promoting transition at the "field level." The Liaisons will be chosen from among transition coordinators, secondary special education teachers and work study coordinators from Missouri school districts. The Liaisons will serve as points of contact for the DESE for input into new forms, procedures and policy issues from the district level. They will also be used to preview training materials. Liaisons will be selected in spring 2008 and will then receive training through the Kansas University Transition Coalition.
- **Community Transition Teams:** Each region of the state will have a group of members from a local community or defined region who will work together to identify available resources for the provision of post-secondary transition services in their area and upload this information to an interactive website. This team will receive training from the KU Transition Coalition. They will utilize the Quality Indicators Needs Assessment to identify needs within the community, complete action planning formats and data collection across a two year time period to identify changes and improvement in services. This process began in January 2008.

These changes were discussed with and approved by the SEAP in January 2008.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	4.5% dropout rate for students with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

The state, with a dropout rate of 5.7%, did not meet the target established for 2006-07. See detail below.

See discussion of the inclusion of data from the Department of Corrections (DOC) under Indicator 1.

Dropout Rates including DOC						
Year	Students with Disabilities			All Students		Gap (Spec Ed - All)
	Number of Dropouts	Child Count Age 14-21	Dropout Rate	Number of Dropouts	Drop Out Rate	
2004-2005	2,760	46,950	5.9%	9,874	3.6%	2.3%
2005-2006	2,673	47,466	5.6%	11,293	4.0%	1.6%
2006-2007	2,685	47,062	5.7%	11,176	4.0%	1.3%

Dropout Rates excluding DOC						
Year	Students with Disabilities			All Students*		Gap (All – Spec Ed)
	Number of Dropouts	Child Count Age 14-21	Drop Out Rate	Number of Dropouts	Drop Out Rate	
2004-2005	2,335	46,433	5.0%	9,874	3.6%	1.4%
2005-2006	2,283	46,952	4.9%	11,308	4.0%	0.9%
2006-2007	2,211	46,555	4.7%	11,176	4.0%	0.7%

Sources: All Students data from School Data and Statistics website as of 11/28/07.

Students with Disabilities data from Screen 12 of Core Data as of 11/28/07.

* DOC does not report data for all students

Formulas:

- Students with Disabilities Dropout Rate: Number of dropouts / Total child count ages 14-21
- All Students Dropout Rate: Number of dropouts / Average enrollment
- Dropouts include exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Maximum Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out

See information under Indicator 1 for a description of who is considered a dropout for students with disabilities and all students. In short, the definitions of dropout for both groups are the same.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

The state did not meet the 2006-07 target for the dropout rate, however the dropout rate excluding data from the Department of Corrections has improved from 2005-06 to 2006-07. The state's dropout rate is largely due to high dropout rates for two large urban districts in the state. The DESE is working closely with these two districts through improvement grants and targeted technical assistance in the area of post-secondary transition. Grant funds for these two districts are supporting the implementation of a number of transition activities, including the following: Quality Eligibility Determination trainings for teachers and administrators, study groups, Ten Sigma (a transition training package developed by Dr. John Wessels of Minnesota), transition academy through the Regional Professional Development Centers and data analysis. Other technical assistance for these districts includes specialized training for the Transition Outcomes Project (TOP), participation in the summer Transition Institute, Consultant/DESE training focusing on the SPP 13 checklist, and RPDC Consultants working directly with district leadership to conduct a needs assessment, and provide ongoing coaching and evaluation of improvement activities. The Division is monitoring the implementation of these strategies through the submission of semi-annual activity reports which are also used for reimbursement of grant activity expenditures.

See Indicator 1 for information on improvement activities completed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No changes were made to targets in the SPP. See Indicator 1 for revisions to improvement activities.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State)] times 100.
- B. Participation rate =
 - a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
 - b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);
 - c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);
 - d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and
 - e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

C. Proficiency rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);
- d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	Percent of districts meeting AYP: 33% Participation rate for children with IEPs: 95% Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA – 42.9% Math – 35.8%

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

The state met the 2006-07 target for Indicator 3B (participation), but did not meet the targets established for 3A (AYP) or 3C (proficiency).

The current statewide assessment program is composed of grade level assessments for grades 3-8 and a high school grade for Communication Arts and Mathematics. Science was piloted in grades 5, 8, and 11 during the 2006-2007 school year, but will not be operational until the 2007-2008 school year.

Public reports of assessment data are available online at
http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html.

A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup.

The AYP Proficiency goals for 2006 were 42.9% for Communication Arts and 35.8% for Mathematics.

Year	Subject	Districts MET for IEP Subgroup	Total Districts with N for IEP Subgroup*	Percent Met for IEP Subgroup
2006	Communication Arts	87	243	35.8%
	Mathematics	153	242	63.2%
	Combined – CA & Math	79	245	32.2%
2007	Communication Arts	32	233	13.7%
	Mathematics	69	230	30.0%
	Combined – CA & Math	25	235	10.6%

* Minimum number of students with disabilities assessed in order to hold a district accountable for NCLB AYP purposes is 50.

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.**MAP and MAP-A Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities**

	Total	Regular MAP Assessment	MAP-Alternate Assessment	Participation Rate	Absent	Not Assessed
2006 Communication Arts	71,345	67,255	3,613	99.3%	374	103
2006 Mathematics	73,074	68,928	3,627	99.3%	423	96
2007 Communication Arts	69,622	65,083	4,090	99.4%	328	121
2007 Mathematics	71,069	66,479	4,103	99.3%	373	114

Source: Table 6 of Section 618 reporting to OSEP

Not Assessed are students who were to take the MAP-Alternate, but did not submit a portfolio.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

"Proficiency" includes the top two of four achievement levels, Proficient and Advanced, on the regular MAP and MAP-Alternate assessments.

MAP and MAP-A Proficiency Rates for Students with Disabilities

	2007 Total	2007 Proficient - Regular Assessment	2007 Proficient - Alternate Assessment	2007 Proficiency Rate	2006 Proficiency Rate
Comm Arts Grade 3	10,665	2,106	499	24.4%	22.9%
Comm Arts Grade 4	10,419	1,962	499	23.6%	21.4%
Comm Arts Grade 5	10,159	1,664	450	20.8%	18.3%
Comm Arts Grade 6	9,791	1,170	416	16.2%	14.2%
Comm Arts Grade 7	9,355	883	440	14.1%	11.8%
Comm Arts Grade 8	10,047	717	420	11.3%	10.6%
Comm Arts Grade 11	7,322	389	329	9.8%	9.8%
Comm Arts Total	67,758	8,891	3,053	17.6%	15.9%
Mathematics Grade 3	10,835	2,688	518	29.6%	28.8%
Mathematics Grade 4	10,496	2,316	516	27.0%	25.2%
Mathematics Grade 5	10,216	1,961	481	23.9%	20.8%
Mathematics Grade 6	9,844	1,534	491	20.6%	17.5%
Mathematics Grade 7	9,578	1,172	498	17.4%	14.0%
Mathematics Grade 8	10,126	931	508	14.2%	12.9%
Mathematics Grade 10	9,020	617	419	11.5%	10.3%
Mathematics Total	70,115	11,219	3,431	20.9%	18.7%

Source: Table 6 of Section 618 reporting to OSEP

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

The percent of students with disabilities who scored proficient or advanced on the Missouri Assessment Program increased from 2006 to 2007 for all subject areas and grade levels except Communication Arts Grade 11, which did not change. These increases averaged about 10% overall, and for some grade levels, exceeded 20% gains. This is seen as significant progress for students with disabilities, despite the fact that the targets were not met. The targets are those set for No Child Left Behind (NCLB) purposes for all students.

The percent of districts meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) decreased sharply in 2007; however, this was to be expected, since the proficiency target increased by 23.6% (34.7% to 42.9%) and 34.6% (26.6% to 35.8%) for Communication Arts and Mathematics, respectively. With the proficiency targets increasing at a much higher rate than the actual proficiency rates, it is very unlikely that the percentage of districts meeting AYP would increase from year to year.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Form and support electronic communities of practice focused on instructional practices for all educators
- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans.
- Identify and disseminate evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator

- Disseminate training on appropriate accommodation decisions and usage
- Assign a DSE staff person to monitor and assess district progress on elementary achievement grants. Develop questions for use with districts regarding the impact of activities on performance.
- Revise grant application process to include elements which will lead districts to implement activities that are likely to result in improvement of student performance.

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Communities of Practice: An online Community of Practice was established in the spring of 2006. Districts were given detailed instruction on how to access and participate in the Community of Practice. Initial posted discussions shared plans for utilizing State Improvement Grant (SIG) monies for improving student outcomes. Since the initial round of discussion, participation in the online Community of Practice has been minimal. In an effort to understand why districts were not using the Community of Practice, a survey was sent to all 27 online registered users. The survey asked about their usage of the Community of Practice and their suggestions for improving the system. Surveys were completed by a total of seven persons, four of which were personnel in districts with a SIG focus on communication arts. Unanimously, these few survey respondents believed a Community of Practice to be necessary. However, they did not feel that the way in which it was implemented met their needs. In regards to connecting with other SIG district personnel and getting helpful ideas, respondents were mostly not satisfied with the online community practice as a tool for doing this. Instead, respondents shared that they were able to gather the same information through their working relationship with the RPDC Special Education consultants. Another comment was that it would be helpful to have follow-up training on how to best utilize the online Community of Practice and perhaps designate a facilitator to guide and prompt discussion.

In the next year, the Division of Special Education will be looking more closely at the underlying issues affecting Community of Practice participation and developing strategies for facilitating participation. Such strategies may include contracting maintenance of a Community of Practice system for SIG districts focused on communication arts to an external expert (similar to the Missouri Transition Community of Practice), designating a skilled facilitator to promote discussion, and providing ongoing training regarding the purpose and potential of a Community of Practice to statewide improvement of educational services for students with disabilities.

Targeted Technical Assistance/Improvement Plan Implementation: See APR overview (pages 4 & 5). Technical assistance and improvement plan implementation offered through the local school improvement grants are collectively described in the following overview categories: SIG; SIG Elementary Achievement; Improvement Planning and Scoring Guide.

Identify and Disseminate Evidence-Based Practices: See APR overview (page 6). Identification and dissemination of evidence-based practices are described in the overview categories labeled MO Resources (MORE) and Consultants.

Disseminate Training: See APR overview (page 6). Dissemination of trainings on accommodations and usage are accomplished through the work of the regional Special Education Consultants described in the overview categories labeled Consultants.

Assign Staff to Monitor Elementary Achievement Grants: Due to changes in the grant application and award processes which only allow for the implementation of evidence-based strategies, this improvement activity has been removed from the SPP.

Revise Grant Application Process: The grant application process underwent initial revisions during the 2006-07 school year (applying to 2007 applicants). See APR overview (page 5), categories IMACS and Improvement Planning and Scoring Guide. Further revisions will apply for districts submitting applications in spring 2008. These revisions will include: inclusion of all districts in invitation to apply; updated scoring guide with graded categories; defined improvement plan template; defined timelines including deadlines; and updated regional trainings offering presentations by Special Education Consultants as well as print resources available in hardcopy and/or on the web.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No changes were made to targets in the SPP. Additional improvement activities have been added in regard to the integrated model and eMINTS. See page 7 of the APR Overview for information on these activities. An activity to assign a DSE staff person to monitor and assess district progress on elementary achievement grants has been removed due to changes in the grant application and award processes which only allow for the implementation of evidence-based strategies. These changes were discussed with and approved by the Special Education Advisory Panel.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year}) / (\# \text{ of districts in the State})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity}) / (\# \text{ of districts in the State})] \times 100$.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	A: 1.5% of districts are identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates B: Not applicable

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

With 0% districts identified with a discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates, the state met the established target of 1.5% of districts identified.

Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than 10 days as well as multiple short sessions summing to more than 10 days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident. For each district with at least five discipline incidents for students with disabilities, the following ratio was calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (Number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (Number of incidents for non-disabled students / enrollment)

Across districts, a mean and standard deviation of the ratios were calculated. Districts with a ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation are considered to have a discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates. The following table outlines the calculations for the 2006-07 school year.

Discipline Data Summary for Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Nondisabled for 2006-07

	(A) Count of Discipline Incidents for SWD	(B) Count of Discipline Incidents for Non- disabled Students	(C) IEP Child Count Ages 3- 22	(D) Total Enrollment less child count = Non- disabled	(E) Discipline Rate per 100 SWD	(F) Discipline Rate per 100 Non- disabled Students	(G) Ratio of Rates for SWD:Non- disabled
All Districts	3,278	9,020	141,419	778,065	2.32	1.16	2.00
Districts with 5 or more Incidents for Students with IEPs	3,005	7,770	92,899	498,469	3.23	1.56	2.08
Mean of Ratios							2.90
Standard Deviation of Ratios							1.85
Mean + 1 Standard Deviation							4.75

Calculations:

$E = (A / C) \times 100$ meaning, on average, there are 3.23 incidents per 100 students with disabilities for districts with five or more incidents for students with disabilities

$F = (B / D) \times 100$ meaning, on average, there are 1.56 incidents per 100 non-disabled students

$G = E / F$ meaning that the discipline rate for students with disabilities is 2.08 times that of nondisabled students

Source: Discipline Incident Data from Screen 09 of Core Data (Discipline)

Once the preliminary list of districts is determined, other factors are taken into account to finalize the list of districts with significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. The following table outlines these factors:

Factors Determining Significant Discrepancies	Number of Districts
Districts with a 2006-07 ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation	10
Of these, the districts remaining after exclusion due to low discipline rates (Districts with an average number of incidents per 100 students less than 2.0 and 1.0, for disabled and nondisabled students, respectively)	9 (one removed due to low discipline rates)
Of these, the districts remaining with ratios greater than the mean + one standard deviation for two consecutive years (2005-06 and 2006-07)	1 (8 removed due to first year identification only)
Of these, the number remaining after data verification conducted	0 (1 removed after data verification & subsequent correction of data)
Number of districts with a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates	0
Percent of districts with a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates for 2006-07	0.0%

This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis.

The following is excerpted from Missouri's letter to OSEP sent September 11, 2007 in response to the Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table: *The section of Missouri's February 1, 2007, APR addressing Rates of Suspension and Expulsion stated that due to the variability of suspension/expulsion data, a district will not be determined to have significant discrepancies unless the discrepancies occur for two years in a row. Based on OSEP's Analysis/Next Steps section of the Response Table, we need to clarify that our process for identifying districts under SPP indicator 4A does involve making annual determinations of whether significant discrepancies in the rate of long term suspension/expulsions are occurring in any responsible public agency in the state, but we are using numerical data collected over more than one year to identify the agencies.*

The DESE believes that there was no noncompliance with the requirements as stated in the clarification sent to OSEP.

Correction of previous noncompliance: As reported in the last APR, five of the six districts reviewed in spring 2006 were required to complete Corrective Action Plans addressing findings of non-compliance from the review. Strategies addressed revision of procedures and practices, as appropriate, in order to bring the district into compliance within 12 months of the notification of non-compliance.

As of the date of this APR, 4 of the 5 districts had already been cleared of the noncompliance within 12 months. The monitoring reports notifying the districts of the noncompliance were dated February 14, 2007; therefore, the correction of non-compliance is not due until February 14, 2008. We anticipate the remaining district will be in compliance within 12 months as well; however, if this district should not be able to provide documentation of correction of non-compliance within 12 months, appropriate sanctions will be imposed upon that district. An update of the remaining district's correction of non-compliance will be included in the February 2009 APR along with data on the correction of noncompliance from 2006-07.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

For the 2006-07 school year (based on 2005-06 and 2006-07 data) no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. This resulted in the state meeting the target for the percent of districts identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates.

The February 1, 2007 APR reported that on-site reviews of policies, procedures and practices occurred in the spring of 2006. OSEP's Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table indicated we needed to demonstrate that we reviewed and, if appropriate required affected LEAs to revise their policies, procedures and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior supports and procedural safeguards.

The on-site reviews that were conducted in the spring of 2006 included three basic components that addressed those required components:

1. Monitoring staff reviewed district policies and procedures related to discipline.
2. Monitoring staff conducted file reviews of students who were long-term suspended or expelled to determine if districts were in compliance with respect to the discipline related requirements of IDEA. The indicators reviewed included such topics as provision of the procedural safeguard notice, as appropriate; conducting manifestation determination meetings; development of IEPs that document provision of services to students who are long term suspended or expelled; review/development of Behavior Intervention Plans and Functional Behavior Assessments; consideration of positive behavioral interventions and supports in the IEP.
3. Monitoring staff conducted interviews of regular and special education staff to assess the level of understanding of staff and practices in place within district buildings related to discipline of

students with and without disabilities. For example, the file reviews demonstrated documentation in the IEP, but interviews shed more light on IEP implementation practices.

In addition to the Corrective Action Plan, these five districts also were required to complete an Improvement Plan related to general policies, procedures and practices of concern that were identified in the review process, but not covered in the compliance Corrective Action Plan. Examples include concerns regarding lack of professional development in areas related to positive behavior supports, Behavior Intervention Plans, Functional Behavior Assessments etc. and lack of consistency in district policies and procedures for behavior management from building to building or classroom to classroom. Districts were required to address identified issues in the Improvement Plans, and the Plans were reviewed to determine that appropriate strategies were included to address the findings, including revision of policies, procedures and practices, as appropriate.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Embed district analysis of policies, procedures and practices as a part of the Self-Assessment for monitoring and the Model Program Evaluation materials
- Annual identification of districts with significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates
- Review/revise definition of significant discrepancy when additional results of reviews of policies, procedures and practices are compiled
- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans
- Identify and disseminate evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator
- Develop and implement use of demonstration sites for PBS in order to demonstrate effectiveness in reducing rates of suspension and expulsion

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

District Self-Assessment: The new IMACS system will include a component to collect data for the discipline reviews. This system will be used to implement the program evaluation regarding discipline that was discussed in the State Performance Plan. Subsequent improvement plans or corrective action plans will be managed through the system as well.

Annual identification of districts: The annual identification process is described above in the Actual Target Data section.

Review/revise definition of significant discrepancy: The definition of significant discrepancy was revised for the identification of districts for the 2005-2006 school year. No changes were deemed necessary for the 2006-07 school year.

Targeted Technical Assistance/Improvement Plan Implementation: See APR overview (page 4). Targeted technical assistance from RPDC special education consultants was received by the five districts that participated in discipline reviews conducted in the spring of 2006 through development of improvement plans and corrective action plans required by the Division of Special Education as a result of the those reviews. Technical assistance and support for improvement plan implementation offered through the local school improvement grants are collectively described in the following overview categories: Fourth cycle focus on SPP indicators; Improvement Planning and Scoring Guide.

Identify and Disseminate Evidence-Based Practices: See APR overview (page 6) Identification and dissemination of evidence-based practices are described in the overview categories labeled MO Resources and Consultants.

Demonstration Sites for Positive Behavior Support (PBS): Demonstration sites have been established for exemplary PBS Schools. See APR overview (page 6) under the category labeled Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Network. A response to intervention webpage has also been established. It is available through the DESE's General Education and Special Education websites.

This page offers sites across the state that have been recognized for successfully implementing 3-tiered approaches, whether behavioral or academic. Beginning in 2007-08, a statewide PBS data collection system is being implemented. Discipline office referral and student assistance referral data will be collected from all schools implementing PBS, which will allow for the evaluation of impact of this model.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No revisions made to targets or improvement activities in the State Performance Plan. The activity to annually identify districts has been removed as this is now standard procedure for the state.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound or hospital placements

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs inside the regular class 80% or more of the day (Column A)) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day (Column C)) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound or hospital placements (Columns D, E and F) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class \geq 80% of the day: 60% Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class < 40% of the day: 10.9% Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings: 3.45%

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

The state met the target for Indicator 5B. The targets for Indicators 5A or 5C were not met, due in part to changes in the data collection described below.

The official language for this indicator refers to the amount of time spent removed from, or outside, the regular class, however, due to a change in the data collection, the “outside” language has been translated to “inside” language for this APR. Example: “Outside regular class less than 21% of the day” translates to “Inside regular class at least 80% of the day.” Also, a data collection change resulted in parentally-placed private school students and students with disabilities in correctional facilities being reported in separate categories, and thereby were removed from the “Inside Regular Class” categories. Because of this, the trend from 2005-06 to 2006-07 should not be considered.

Special Education Placement Data for ages 6-21

	2005-06		2006-07	
	#	%	#	%
Inside Regular Class ≥ 80% (5A)	73,430	57.4%	70,321	55.8%
Inside Regular Class 40-79%	35,439	27.7%	34,316	27.2%
Inside Regular Class < 40% (5B)	14,373	11.2%	13,414	10.6%
Separate School	4,029	3.1%	3,970	3.2%
Homebound/Hospital	658	0.5%	655	0.5%
Residential Facility	7	0.0%	7	0.0%
Total Separate (5C)	4,694	3.7%	4,632	3.7%
Correctional Facilities			907	0.7%
Parentally-Placed Private School			2,401	1.9%
Total School Age	127,936	100.0%	125,991	100.0%

Source: Core Data Screen 11 – Child Count and Placements

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

The data above indicate that the state did not meet the targets established for the 2006-07 school year for Inside Regular Class ≥ 80% (5A) or separate settings (5C), however, this is in part due to federal data collection changes which removed students in correctional facilities and parentally-placed private school students from the “Inside Regular Class” categories. The state met the 2006-07 target for Inside Regular Class < 40% (5B). While the target for “Separate” placements was not met, and the percentage did not change from the previous year, the number of students in these placements decreased.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Identify, encourage and support demonstration sites for co-teaching, inclusion, differentiated instruction, PBS and RTI
- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans
- Identify and disseminate evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator
- Collaborate with other department initiatives to promote co-teaching, inclusion and differentiated instruction i.e. Teaching and Learning Conference, Professional Learning Communities, Reading First, High Schools that Work, etc.

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Demonstration Sites: Demonstration sites have been established for exemplary Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) Schools. See APR overview (page 6) under the category labeled Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Network. A response to intervention webpage has also been established. It is available through the DESE's General Education and Special Education websites. This page offers sites across the state that have been recognized for successfully implementing 3-tiered approaches, whether behavioral or academic.

Targeted Technical Assistance: The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) targets complete an improvement plan to address poor performance. Districts completing improvement plans will analyze LRE data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, can address it through an objective and strategies.

RPDC Consultants continue to make trainings available to all districts, using LRE training modules for both K-12 and Early Childhood Special Education. In addition, the DESE-supported Co-teaching module, based on the trainings of Marilyn Friend is being revised and disseminated during the 2007-2008 school year. Plans include adapting the module to facilitate web-based trainings during the 2008-2009 school year. See APR overview (page 4) under the category labeled SIG Elementary Achievement for additional information.

Identify and Disseminate Evidence-based Practices: See APR overview (page 6) under the category labeled MO Resources (MORE).

Collaborate with other department initiatives: Collaboration has taken place between department initiatives in the form of planning for the Missouri Integrated Model design. See APR overview (page 7) under the category labeled Missouri Integrated Model. The Division of Special Education has also collaborated by contributing funding to support regional consultants who provide assistance implementing Professional Learning Communities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

As allowed by OSEP, targets in the SPP have been revised slightly due to the change in the federal data collection which removes parentally-placed private school students and students in correctional facilities from the targeted categories, most prominently from the Inside Regular more than 80% category. See page 21 of the SPP for target changes. The revised target for the 2007-08 school year for the Inside Regular more than 80% category is 2% lower than the original target. This is less of a decrease than the percent of students now reported in the parentally-placed private school and correctional facility categories (approximately 2.5% as indicated in the data table above). Therefore, while the data collection change resulted in the percent of students in regular placements by approximately 2.5%, the target for this category was only decreased by 2.0%. This demonstrates that while the state did change the targets due to the federal data collection changes, the change was not as extensive as would have been allowed by the data.

The impact of the new parentally-placed private school and correctional facility categories was determined to be negligible for the other two SPP/APR indicator categories (Inside regular less than 40% and separate placements); therefore the targets for those categories were not changed.

In order to address targets not met, and to support an overall increase in the number of students receiving services in the regular classroom, three improvement activities have been added to the SPP. These include the eMINTS Text-to-Speech Pilot, adopting and disseminating the Marilyn Friend co-teaching model, and the development and implementation of an integrated, three-tiered model of instruction which will serve to increase districts' ability to serve students with disabilities in the regular classroom.

These changes and additions were presented to and approved by the Special Education Advisory Panel.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	Not applicable due to data collection change. See the Missouri SPP.

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

Per OSEP instructions, due to federal data collection changes, states need not report on this indicator for the 2006-07 school year. New baseline data and targets will need to be established in the future.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

Not applicable

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

Not applicable

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

For each of

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
 - a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning
 - b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers
 - c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it
 - d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers
 - e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
All Years	To be established in February 2010 update of the SPP

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

See Missouri State Performance Plan

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

See Missouri State Performance Plan

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

See Missouri State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	77.0% of parents will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

Missouri, at 69.4% of parents reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, did not meet the target established for the 2006-07 school year.

The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) has the responsibility of reviewing and accrediting the 524 school districts in Missouri on a five-year review cycle. MSIP reviews are conducted each year for approximately 100 (or 20%) of the 524 districts as well as other responsible public agencies. These reviews include the distribution of surveys to students, teachers, administrators and parents. Parent surveys are used to collect information on participation in special education and other programs, the level of parental involvement in various school related activities, and parent perceptions of school, staff, teachers, administrators and learning environment. The surveys are sent to all parents in the school districts.

Survey Instrument: The complete MSIP parent advance questionnaire can be found at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/sia/msip/advquest/parent.pdf>.

The MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire contains two items directly related to this indicator:

- My involvement in my child's education has improved his/her achievement.
- The school encourages parents to be involved.

If parents agree or strongly agree with both, then they are counted as being in agreement with this SPP indicator.

The table below shows the rates of agreement with both items for parents of students with disabilities. Results from all respondents and results from a derived representative sample are provided.

The parent survey asks for demographic data, including basic household information, race, age, education level and income, among others.

The University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED) has an existing model for constructing a "state sample" from Advance Questionnaire data. The model is based on two criteria: Percent Free & Reduced Lunch (FRL), and Minority status (Minority=Black, Hispanic, Asian;

Majority=White). The first step determines the FRL characteristic of each school building in the state and divides them into three groups. The second step determines the overall student enrollments, as well as the Minority/Majority enrollments at the state level, within each of the above FRL categories. This produces a stratified sampling scheme at the state level which contains six cells:

FRL	Minority	Majority
Less Than 33%	cell 1	cell 2
33% to 54%	cell 3	cell 4
55% or More	cell 5	cell 6

Valid and reliable data: A sample of 2,000 Special Education parents was drawn using the above sampling scheme. The results from the sample compared to the results from all respondents are shown below. The differences in the percents in agreement are not significant, thereby establishing the reliability of the data. The validity of the data is ensured through use of the MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire, which has been determined by OSEDA to be a valid instrument for gathering data from parents.

Results of Parent Survey 2006-07

	Agree	Not Agree	Total
Parents of Students with Disabilities (all respondents)	4,461 (69.4%)	1,965 (30.6%)	6,426 (100.0%)
Parents of Students with Disabilities (representative sample)	1,400 (71.5%)	577 (28.5%)	1,957 (100.0%)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

The state did not meet the target established for the 2006-07 school year, however, as discussed in the State Performance Plan, the targets were based on data from only one school district and targets for subsequent years are being revised.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Determine methodology/criteria and identify districts with good parental involvement. Provide incentive for districts to serve as model districts.
- Include parent involvement as part of scoring rubric for improvement plans (involvement in needs assessment, activity's potential to strengthen parent involvement)

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Identification of parent involvement models: The Missouri Parent Act (MPACT) Coordinator of Parent Initiatives worked to determine methodology/criteria and identify districts with good parent involvement. The Coordinator of Parent Initiatives conducted research of national research products relating to effective involvement, including the review of improvement planning activities from other states and districts in Missouri. This research was being used to create a rubric for districts to use that will identify schools that are implementing effective Parent Involvement strategies and practices.

Improvement Plan Scoring Rubric: Parent involvement is included as part of the scoring rubric for improvement plans. Parents are included in the stakeholder group to develop the needs assessment. In addition, activities are scored on the potential to strengthen parent involvement, although not all activities lend themselves to parent involvement.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

Revisions to targets have been made in the SPP. See page 28 of the SPP. As described in the SPP, the MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire (AQ) had been modified for the fourth cycle of the MSIP which began with the 2006-07 school year. The Parent AQ was field tested in 2005-06 with only one district, and targets were established based on the responses from that one district. The 2006-07 data represents 1/5 of the districts in the state, and based on the analysis conducted by OSEDA which found the responses to be representative of the state, is being used to revise future targets.

The changes to targets were presented to and approved by the Special Education Advisory Panel.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

The state met the 2006-07 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The following is excerpted from Missouri's letter to OSEP sent September 11, 2007 in response to their Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table: *...our process for identifying districts under SPP indicator 9 involves making annual determinations of whether any district exhibits disproportionate representation based on race or ethnicity, but we are using numerical data collected over more than one year to identify the agencies.*

In addition, we inaccurately used the term "significant disproportionality" as opposed to "disproportionate representation" in the February 2007 SPP. The description of our identification and monitoring process in our SPP, in fact, refers to the SPP 9 requirements related to disproportionate representation. Based upon this explanation, we do not believe that we are out of compliance with 34 CFR 300.646.

Due to the inaccurate use of the term, and knowing that the February 2007 SPP was not, in fact, addressing significant disproportionality, this APR does not address the topic of "significant disproportionality."

For 2006-07, Missouri changed the methodology used to identify districts with disproportionate representation in order to address over-and under-representation of all racial/ethnic groups. These changes are also described in the State Performance Plan (SPP). The SPP also provides data on the number of districts that would have been identified in the previous year using the new methodology.

The new method uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for every racial/ethnic group. Based on this, the working definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio of greater than 2.5 for over-representation or less than 0.25 for under representation for two consecutive years, along with a minimum of 20 students in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for those two years. Unique district characteristics are also considered so that districts are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the district boundaries or other similar situations. The table below summarizes the criteria.

Criteria/Definition of “Disproportionate Representation”

Risk Ratio	Cell size
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 0.25 for under representation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 20 in racial/ethnic group <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 20 in comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)

Data for all districts/LEAs are examined every year. The following table displays the numbers of districts meeting the criteria for two consecutive years and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation. As stated previously, districts are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

Year	Number of districts meeting “over” or “under” criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)
2006-07 identification using data from 2005-06 & 2006-07	0 districts under and 0 districts over in any race/ethnicity category

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (Core Data Screen 16).

If districts had been identified, the review process would consist of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. For each student file reviewed, a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated. Then a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated for all students in a particular disability category (or total special education) and racial/ethnic group (i.e. black students with disabilities, white students with disabilities, black MR students, white MR students, etc). The percents in compliance for each disability/race are then compared, and if results for the group that was identified as being over or under-represented are more than 80% below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education. For example, if a district file review found that 75% of compliance indicators were in compliance for black special education students, and 96% of compliance indicators were in compliance for special education students of other race/ethnicities, then the 75% and the 96% is compared. 75 is 78% of 96, which is less than the 80% acceptable difference, and the district would be found to have inappropriate identification of black students with disabilities.

As indicated in the table above, in 2006-07 no districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2005-06 and 2006-07, therefore no reviews were conducted resulting in no districts with disproportionate representation of any racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

0% of districts (0 / 524 = 0%) in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification since none had disproportionate representation. See Indicator 10 for information on the review process directed towards specific disability categories.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

The state met the 2006-07 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

Results of previous reviews and correction of noncompliance: For the initial writing of the State Performance Plan (February 2007), eleven districts had been identified based on 2004-05 data using the original methodology, not the new risk ratio method. In early 2006, DESE contracted with the University of Missouri to conduct the reviews of policies, procedures and practices for those districts identified as having disproportionate representation of students identified as eligible for special education services or disproportionate representation of students who receive their special education services in restrictive placements. The reviewers made up the Missouri Disproportionality Collaborative (MODAC) which included faculty from University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia College of Education, and University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis. DESE and MODAC worked collaboratively to establish the review process, which included the NCCREST district self-assessment, staff surveys and interviews and file reviews. The rubric utilized for the reviews was an adaptation of the NCCREST Evaluation Rubric. Eighteen standards were spread across four goal areas with three possible ratings for each standard: Beginning, Developing, and At-Standard. To determine if a district had policies, practices, and procedures in place to prevent disproportionate representation of students identified as eligible for special education placements or within restrictive special education placements, criteria was set to determine the need for any corrective action plans based upon attainment of at least 80% (14.4 marks) of the ratings within the At-Standard or Developing levels. If this total of standards was found to be lower than 80% (14.4 marks), the Division required a corrective action plan. The districts were reviewed by the MODAC in the spring of 2006.

Final results of these reviews identified one district as having disproportionate representation that was a result of inappropriate identification. This district had over-representation of black students in special education as well as in two disability categories. A corrective action plan was issued. The district corrected the non-compliance within twelve months of official letter notification.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Review/revise existing procedures for identification of districts and the review of district procedures, policies and practices
- Implement revised review process
- Identify and disseminate training and technical assistance resources
- Include disproportionality review component in the web-based IMACS system

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

Review/revise existing procedures and implement revised review process: The Division of Special Education has revised the process for identifying districts with disproportionate representation and the process for reviewing the procedures, policies and practices of those districts in order to determine if there is inappropriate identification of students with disabilities by racial/ethnic groups. The revised method for identifying districts is described above and in the SPP. The review process for districts identified in 2006-07 consisted of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. The review process is described above.

Identify and Disseminate Training and Technical Assistance Resources: See APR overview (page 6) under the category labeled MO Resources.

Include disproportionality review component in the web-based IMACS system: The disproportionality review process was built into the IMACS system during summer/fall 2007 and is being used to review districts identified with disproportionate representation of students in special education. This review process will be made available to districts to use on a voluntary basis during the 2007-08 school year.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No revisions were made to targets or improvement activities in the State Performance Plan. The Overview of Issue section in the SPP has been revised to describe the new methodology for identification of districts with disproportionate representation and the SPP includes data on the number of districts that would have been identified in previous years using the new risk ratio criteria.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

The state met the 2006-07 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

Refer to Indicator 9 in this APR for Missouri's responses to OSEP's Part B FY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table in regard to Missouri's identification procedures for disproportionate representation and the use of the term "significant disproportionality."

Also refer to the SPP Overview of Issue for Indicator 9 (or information in APR Indicator 9) for a description on changes made to the methodology used to identify and review districts with disproportionate representation. The table below summarizes the criteria used for identifying under and over representation for all racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

Criteria/Definition of "Disproportionate Representation"

Risk Ratio	Cell size
Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation OR Less than 0.25 for under representation	At least 20 in disability and racial/ethnic group AND At least 20 in disability and comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)

Data for all districts are examined every year. The following table displays the numbers of districts meeting the criteria for 2006-07 and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation for each disability category. As stated previously, districts are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

Year	Number of districts meeting “over” or “under” criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)
2006-07 identification using data from 2005-06 & 2006-07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLD: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category • Autism: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category • Sp/Lang: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category • ED: 2 districts with overrepresentation of black students • MR: 5 districts with overrepresentation of black students • OHI: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (Core Data Screen 16).

Note: Information provided for the following disability categories: Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), Autism, Speech/Language (Sp/Lang), Emotional Disturbance (ED), Mental Retardation (MR), and Other Health Impaired (OHI).

As indicated in the table above, for 2006-07, seven districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2005-06 and 2006-07 (two in the area of Emotional Disturbance and five in the area of Mental Retardation). These districts were subsequently reviewed in December 2007 to determine if the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification.

The district review process consists of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. For each student file reviewed, a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated. Then a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated for all students in a particular disability category (or total special education) and racial/ethnic group (i.e. black students with disabilities, white students with disabilities, black MR students, white MR students, etc). The percents in compliance for each disability/race are then compared, and if results for the group that was identified as being over or under-represented are more than 80% below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education. For example, if a district file review found that 75% of compliance indicators were in compliance for black MR students, and 96% of compliance indicators were in compliance for MR students of other race/ethnicities, then the 75% and the 96% are compared. 75 is 78% of 96, which is less than the 80% acceptable difference, and the district would be found to have inappropriate identification of black students in the MR disability category.

Information on district policies, procedures and practices were gathered from the seven districts identified as having disproportionate representation. No concerns were identified based upon the review of written policies and procedures related to identification of students with disabilities. Student files for recently identified students in the Mental Retardation or Emotional Disturbance disability categories were also gathered. The file review process outlined above was conducted. None of the seven districts were found to have disproportionate representation of students with disabilities as a result of inappropriate identification. The review will result in some of the districts having a corrective action plan due to findings of systemic noncompliance across all of the student files reviewed, however the noncompliance was not related to the disproportionality issues.

0% of districts (0 / 524 = 0%) in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

The state met the 2006-07 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

Results of previous reviews and correction of noncompliance: The eleven districts identified as having disproportionate representation based on 2004-2005 data were reviewed by the Missouri Disproportionality Collaborative (MODAC) in the spring of 2006. See Indicator 9 for a full description of the review process. Final results of this review identified one district found to have disproportionate representation that was a result of inappropriate identification. This district had over-representation of black students in special education as well as in two disability categories. A corrective action plan was issued. The district corrected the non-compliance within twelve months of official letter notification.

See Indicator 9 for a discussion of improvement activities completed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No revisions made to targets or improvement activities in the State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Account for children included in a, but not included in, b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate will be evaluated and have eligibility determined within 60 days

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

While Missouri did not meet the target of 100%, 94.0% of the evaluations were completed within 60 days.

The OSEP Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table indicated that it appeared that the state was reporting data based on a State-established timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted. That is correct. The State of Missouri uses the 60 day timeline for completion of initial evaluations which is the same as the federal timeline, however Missouri regulations allow for an extension of the timeline if there are exceptional circumstances such as delays due to family or child illness or school delays due to inclement weather or extended school breaks.

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of initial evaluations within 60 days, districts completing a self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes were required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program.

Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state.

These data were gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS). Districts entered the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:

- Student's initials
- Date of parental consent to evaluate
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible Y/N
- Eligibility determined in 60 days (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
 - Acceptable reason Y/N

Verification of the district reported evaluation timeline data was completed by compliance supervisors or by on-site visits conducted by compliance supervisors and other assigned DSE staff.

The file review process included checking the 60 day evaluation timeline information by using a calendar system. If the districts included initial evaluation timelines which were not within 60 days, the following criteria were accepted as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines:

- Snow days or other school closures due to inclement weather
- Agency vacation days
- Child's absence because of illness
- Summer break
- Parent refuses/fails to produce child
- Change in district of enrollment during evaluation process (per 300.301(d))

Delays were considered out of compliance if the reasons for the extensions were not acceptable or if the districts failed to provide a reason for the extension of the timeline.

Year	Number with consent to evaluate	Number within 60 day timeline	Number > 60 days with acceptable reason	Number within 60 days or with acceptable reason	Percent within acceptable timelines
2006-07 Eligible	1,487	1,204	181	1,385 (c)	93.1%
2006-07 Not Eligible	505	414	74	488 (b)	96.6%
2006-07 Total	1,992 (a)	1,617	256	1,873	94.0%

Calculation = $(b + c / a) \times 100$ where a=the number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received; b=the number determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days or with acceptable reason; and c=the number determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days or with acceptable reason.

Source: District reported data (via IMACS) from a total of 107 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2006-07. A total of 100 of the 107 districts had conducted initial evaluations during the year.

Acceptable delays are included in the numerator and denominator of the percent within acceptable timelines.

Year	2005-06	2006-07
Percent within acceptable timelines	94.7%	94.0%

The number of days past the 60 day timeline ranged from one day to 150 days, with most of the delays due to acceptable reasons. Approximately three quarters of the delays were 20 days or less. The longest delay was due to the child leaving the district for a period of time and then returning which was an acceptable delay. The longest unacceptable delays were due to evaluation/testing information not being

returned in a timely fashion. Most unacceptable timelines were deemed unacceptable due to lack of specific information from the districts as to the length of school breaks or that legitimate reasons did not explain the entire delay.

Correction of previous noncompliance: The 94.7% within acceptable timelines from the 2005-06 school year resulted in four districts with findings of systemic noncompliance. Those districts were all cleared of the noncompliance within 12 months from the date of notification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

The comparison for school years 2005-06 to 2006-07 shows a slight decrease of less than one percent, from 94.7% to 94.0% within acceptable timelines. The 2006-07 data will result in only four districts having a systemic noncompliance call, one of which is a very large urban district in the state. When the data for that district are removed, the overall percentage increases to 98.4% compliance with timelines for initial evaluations.

Technical assistance provided to the urban district mentioned above has been ongoing. The RPDC consultant has worked closely with the DSE staff and the district staff to ensure compliance in all areas.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Targeted technical assistance and training to determine causes of delayed evaluations and to determine strategies to resolve failure to meet timelines.
- Require training on evaluation procedures in corrective action plans.

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

Targeted technical assistance: State Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Special Education Compliance Consultants worked with Division of Special Education (DSE) supervisors to target the districts who needed assistance in meeting the 60 day timeline for completing initial evaluations. Compliance supervisors notified RPDC compliance consultants of districts who received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in the area of 60 day timelines. Upon notification, the RPDC consultants worked with districts to assist them in determining the reasons for the delays and to ensure they develop strategies to correct the non-compliance.

Technical assistance provided to the urban district mentioned previously is ongoing. The RPDC Compliance consultants have worked closely with the DSE staff and the district staff to ensure compliance in all areas. The RPDC Compliance Consultants meet weekly to review progress on improvement plan activities. They have arranged a series of professional development activities with staff on an ongoing basis related to transfer, transition, re-evaluations, and initial evaluations. With the assistance of the RPDC consultants, the district did mock reviews at the beginning of the school year and they are continuing to do this on a monthly basis. During these reviews, staff is bringing files to identify model files and files that can be corrected.

Require training on evaluation procedures in corrective action plans: Districts that are not in compliance with meeting the 60 day timelines must include strategies in their corrective action plans to correct the noncompliance. The strategies generally include working with the RPDC Compliance Consultants and arranging for training for their staff regarding evaluation procedures. This activity was removed from the SPP since it is a part of the previous improvement activity.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No revisions were made to targets, but an additional improvement activity emphasizing ongoing training was added in order to be proactive in achieving full compliance in this area. Additional detail has been added to the improvement activities, and this detail resulted in one improvement activity being redundant, therefore it has been removed from the SPP. The changes were presented to and approved by the Special Education Advisory Panel.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for who parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a, but not included in b, c or d. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

With 80.3% of Part C to Part B transition timelines met for 2006-07, Missouri did not meet the target of 100%.

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of C to B transition timelines, districts required to complete a self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes were required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program.

Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state.

Data for 2006-07 were gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. Districts enter the following information for each student referred from Part C during the reporting period:

- Student's initials
- Date of birth
- Date of referral
- Date of eligibility
- Date of IEP
- IEP in place by third birthday (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
 - Acceptable reason Y/N

The information is reviewed by Compliance supervisors as a part of the desk review of the self-assessments.

Reasons given for delay in eligibility determination and IEP development include:

- Late referral from Part C
- Parent/child unavailability, holidays, and child illness
- Districts delaying evaluation until 3rd birthday. Misunderstanding by districts that IEP has to be in place by 3rd birthday, not just evaluation started
- Districts waiting for outside evaluation information
- Districts allowing parents to delay eligibility determination meetings.

While most of the reasons listed for having Part B eligibility determined and an IEP in place by the child's third birthday are unacceptable, Missouri does allow for extension of evaluation timelines for some things (parent request, child illness or unavailability, school vacations/holidays) which might result in the evaluation being extended resulting in the development of the IEP past the child's third birthday. However, the current data collection system does not allow for us to determine if this was the primary reason for any of the children reported above, so no reasons for exceeding the timelines were determined to be acceptable.

Part C to Part B Referrals

	2006-07
Total referred from Part C and eligible for ECSE	157
IEP in place by third birthday (Acceptable Timelines)	126
Delay in eligibility determination and IEP development by third birthday	31
Percent Acceptable = Acceptable / (Total Eligible)	80.3%

Source: District reported data (via IMACS) from a total of 107 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2006-07. A total of 26 of the 107 districts had received referrals from Part C.

The data collection for 2006-07 did not allow the state to determine the following data elements:

- the total number of children referred from Part C
- the number for whom parental consent to evaluate was not obtained
- the number of children referred who were determined ineligible
- the number of children for whom the evaluation timelines were extended for acceptable reasons resulting in the eligibility determination &/or IEP development exceeding the third birthday

The data collection for 2007-08 has been changed to collect all of these items.

Despite not having the above mentioned items for 2006-07, the data above accurately reflect the number and percentage of children who were found eligible for ECSE and who had an IEP in place by the third birthday, as required by this indicator.

Of the 31 children who did not have the IEP in place by the third birthday, 21 had the IEP in place within one month of turning three. The longest delays were 193 days due to documented attempts to contact the family and 90 days due to a staff member being on medical leave. Most of the delays were due to the inability to contact the family or because of late referrals from Part C.

The districts found out of compliance with this indicator will be required to complete corrective action plans and correct the noncompliance within 12 months of the date of their final reports.

Correction of previous noncompliance: Four districts had findings of systemic noncompliance based on the 2005-06 data. Those districts were all cleared of the noncompliance within 12 months from the date of notification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

The comparison for school years 2005-06 to 2006-2007 shows a decrease from 95.4% to 80.3% within acceptable timelines. The decrease is due to clarification from OSEP that we had not listed any acceptable reasons for delay in IEP development by the third birthday for eligible children for whom parental consent to evaluate had been obtained. The 80.3% appears to be a significant slippage from the 95.4% of the previous year, however, the 95.4% was calculated based upon a different set of factors (including acceptable reasons which we have been informed are no longer acceptable). When using a comparable calculation for the 2005-06 data, the resulting percentage was 76.2%, thus with comparable calculations a slight increase from 76.2% to 80.3% is shown. Nevertheless, the 100% target was not met and, as indicated in the improvement activities for this indicator, technical assistance will be provided to districts regarding compliance in the area of Part C to Part B transition. Also, as indicated above, our data collection system has been changed to collect additional data.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Finalize and disseminate Part C to B Transition Module for early intervention and early childhood staff
- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans.

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

Finalize and disseminate Part C to B Transition Module: Missouri used State Improvement Grant (SIG) funds to develop and implement a comprehensive Transition Module addressing the Part C requirements as well as the significance to Early Childhood Special Education under Part B. The Part C to B Transition Module was completed in November, 2007 and was posted on the web in December, 2007.

Targeted technical assistance: The wording of this improvement activity has been changed to "provide targeted technical assistance to districts who received Corrective Action Plans related to C to B Transition." Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Special Education Compliance Consultants worked with Division of Special Education (DSE) supervisors to target the districts who needed assistance in meeting the Part C to B timelines. Compliance supervisors notified RPDC compliance consultants of districts who received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in the area of Part C to B timelines. The RPDC consultants worked with districts to assist them in determining the reasons for the delays and to ensure they develop strategies to correct the non-compliance.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No revisions were made to targets in the State Performance Plan. Additional detail has been added to the improvement activities, and an additional improvement activity has been added to provide ongoing technical assistance to be proactive in achieving full compliance in this area. These changes were presented to and approved by the Special Education Advisory Panel.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	100% of youth aged 16 and above will have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

The state did not meet the 100% target for 2006-07, but had 73.2% compliance which is a significant improvement from the 44.8% in the previous APR.

Data for 2006-07 were gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program. Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state. There were 107 districts that completed a self-assessment in 2006-07.

The data represent 85 districts that had transition-age students with disabilities. Districts completed a file reviews on transition age students and answered the following questions for each student:

- Is there a measurable postsecondary goal or goals that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living?
- Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goals(s)?
- Are there transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?
- For transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies with parent (or child once the age of majority is reached) consent, is there evidence that representatives of the agency(ies) were invited to the IEP meeting?
- Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s)?
- Do the transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?

The information is reviewed by Compliance supervisors as a part of the desk review of the self-assessments, and the district calls are verified as correct or not.

Year	Number of Transition Plans Reviewed	Number that Met Standard	Percent that Met Standard
2005-06	460	206	44.8%
2006-07	508	372	73.2%

Source: Student file reviews (via IMACS) from a total of 107 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2006-07. A total of 85 of the 107 districts had transition-age students.

Correction of previous noncompliance: The 44.8% of compliance from the 2005-06 school year resulted in 61 districts having findings of systemic noncompliance. The data were gathered as part of the self-assessments done in the year prior to the monitoring year, which was 2006-07 for these districts. The monitoring reports notifying the districts of the noncompliance were dated March 14, 2007; therefore, the correction of non-compliance is not due until March 2008. As of the date of this APR, 46 of the 61 districts had already been cleared of the noncompliance within 12 months. We anticipate the remaining 15 districts will be in compliance within 12 months as well; however, if any district should not be able to provide documentation of correction of non-compliance within 12 months, appropriate sanctions will be imposed upon those districts. An update of the remaining districts' correction of non-compliance will be included in the February 2009 APR along with data on the correction of noncompliance from 2006-07.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

While not meeting the 100% target, results for the 2006-07 school year showed significant improvement over the previous year, and even more improvement is anticipated due to training and technical assistance available to districts on this topic.

In addition to improvement activities under SPP Indicator 1, improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Develop and implement training on secondary transition planning
- Develop website for secondary transition and post tools that the state will use for monitoring this indicator
- Targeted technical assistance to districts with poor compliance results to determine and correct causes

Discussion of the improvement activities follows. These activities are in addition to all the activities reported under SPP Indicator 1. All transition-related activities involve the development of compliant IEP transition plans. The following are more specific to the compliance aspects of the transition checklist.

Training on secondary transition planning: A series of regular trainings on transition planning was conducted by the RPDC Consultants. The information was disseminated through presentations, conferences, workshops and MSIP trainings. The state has contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary to provide training on the Transition Outcomes Projects (TOP). See Indicator 1 for more information.

Develop website for secondary transition: An online community of practice was developed for Missouri in conjunction with the University of Kansas Transition Coalition. The indicator 13 checklist is posted at this site.

Targeted technical assistance to districts: Each district with systemic noncompliance in transition has received targeted technical assistance in correcting noncompliance related to indicator 13 through DSE Compliance Supervisors and/or RPDC Compliance Consultants.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No revisions were made to the targets. See SPP Indicator 1 for revisions to improvement activities.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition**

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	See the Missouri State Performance Plan

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

Not applicable for the APR - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

Not applicable - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

Not applicable - see the Missouri State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	100% of findings of noncompliance will be corrected within 12 months

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

Missouri did not meet the 100% target for correction of non-compliance within twelve months; however, Missouri did show significant improvement in this area. Last year Missouri's percentage was 32.29% for correction of non-compliance within 12 months and this year it is 95.4%.

A total of 109 districts, 8 charter schools, and 5 other state agencies and State Board operated programs were monitored during 2005-06, resulting in a total of 122 districts/agencies. The Special Education monitoring follows the five-year accreditation cycle for the state of Missouri. Every district is reviewed once within the five year period, and 2005-06 was the last year of Missouri's 3rd cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP). For more information on the Special Education monitoring process, please see the APR Overview titled 4th Cycle Focus on State Performance Plan Indicators. In addition to the MSIP cohort, 11 districts were reviewed for disproportionality during 2005-06. Results of these reviews are provided in the tables below. The columns of the tables are as follows:

- # of Programs monitored – the total number of agencies monitored in the specified area or the number of agencies with noncompliance calls as a result of dispute resolution
- # of Findings of noncompliance identified in 2005-06 – the total number of monitoring indicators and/or dispute resolution allegations found out of compliance across the districts/agencies reviewed. This is a duplicated count of districts/agencies when districts/agencies had more than one finding of noncompliance in an SPP indicator area
- # of Findings for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification – the total number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year from the date of the reports to districts
- % of findings with correction within one year – the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year
- % of finding with correction as of 12/3/07 – the percent of findings of noncompliance that had been corrected by December 3, 2007

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of Programs Monitored	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in 2005-06	(b) # of Findings from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	% of findings with correction within one year (b)/(a)	% of finding with correction as of 12/3/07
1, 2, 13, 14: Secondary Transition	Monitoring: On-site visits, self-assessment, desk review, etc.	122	100	99	99.0%	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		0	0	NA	NA
3, 7: Statewide assessment and early childhood outcomes	Monitoring	122	205	197	96.1%	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		9	9	100.0%	100.0%
4A: Discipline	Monitoring	32	12	12	100.0%	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		4	4	100.0%	100.0%
5, 6: Educational environments/ placements	Monitoring	122	295	286	96.9%	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		22	22	100.0%	100.0%
8: Parent Involvement	Monitoring	122	370	344	92.8%	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		23	23	100.0%	100.0%
9, 10: Disproportionality	Monitoring	11	1	1	100.0%	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		0	0	NA	NA
11: Initial evaluations	Monitoring	122	194	181	93.3%	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		6	6	100.0%	100.0%
12: Part C to Part B Transition	Monitoring	40	4	4	100.0%	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		0	0	100.0%	100.0%
Total			1245	1188	95.4%	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

At this point of reporting, 100% of the noncompliance identified in the 2005-06 school year has been corrected and 95.4% had been corrected within 12 months from identification. The marked improvement from the 32.29% of timely correction reported in the February 2007 APR, is largely a result of making this SPP indicator a high priority and implementing the improvement activities discussed below.

Correction of noncompliance from previous APR: In the APR report of February 2007, we indicated that seven districts had not corrected their non-compliance identified in the 2004-05 school year. Three of those seven districts had been sanctioned and four were to provide evidence of correction of non-compliance. The DSE stated it believed that correction of non-compliance of all districts could be achieved within the year. By January 1, 2008, these seven districts had corrected all non-compliance.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Revise and implement a comprehensive general supervision system that
 - Identifies procedural noncompliance
 - Corrects identified noncompliance in a timely manner
 - Focuses on performance of students with disabilities
 - Includes a system of rewards and sanctions
- Implement targeted technical assistance that will enable districts to
 - Effectively and efficiently meet compliance requirements
 - Progress toward meeting the targets for student performance in the SPP
- Implement a regional support system for corrective action plans and improvement plans
- Contract for web-based monitoring management system
- Implement web-based system for monitoring and self-assessment purposes
- Assign a staff person to coordinate follow-up reviews to ensure that they are completed in timely manner.
- Generate and review monthly reports of districts with remaining noncompliance in order to implement activities to correct the noncompliance within 12 months.

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Revise and implement a comprehensive general supervision system: As the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) prepared to enter into a new Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) five year monitoring cycle, which began in 2006-07, the Division of Special Education worked closely with National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and several groups of stakeholders on focused monitoring procedures. As described in the APR Overview, the new procedures focused strongly on the SPP performance areas by establishing thresholds for Graduation and Dropout Rates, Performance on Statewide Assessments, LRE, and Discipline and requiring both a compliance file review using related compliance indicators and the development of improvement plans in areas which the district did not meet established thresholds. Results of the self assessment (file review) are verified through a Division of Special Education (DSE) desk review, and Improvement Plans are also reviewed using a scoring guide developed with the assistance of the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC). See the APR overview for a description of focused monitoring on-site reviews in 4th cycle. The system we put in place attempted to reward districts that are demonstrating solid performance in key SPP areas. In addition to the focused file review, we require file review for all districts during their monitoring year in the areas of postsecondary transition (Indicator 13), referral, review of existing data, and evaluation because we have determined these are priorities based on past concerns in these areas. In addition, we collect data on initial evaluations and Part C to B transition timelines and monitor for compliance in these areas. Corrective Action Plans are required for any identified systemic non-compliance, and this must be corrected within 12 months of the district's notification of the findings. Procedures have been put in place utilizing our new web based monitoring system (IMACS) and more frequent contact by RPDC consultants and DESE supervisors to help ensure timely correction. Districts are informed about enforcement actions that may be taken when they attend the required self assessment training and through correspondence regarding

findings of non-compliance. Districts must also correct findings of non-compliance on an individual child basis, and follow up procedures have been designed to monitor this as well.

The monitoring/general supervision is also closely linked with the Department's MSIP process, which is tied to district accreditation, and results of special education monitoring, including results of data reviews and improvement planning, are highlighted in the district's MSIP report. This is important, because the MSIP report receives a high level of attention from the district, the school board and the community.

Implement targeted technical assistance: Many strategies were put in place to provide technical assistance to districts that were required to provide evidence of correction of non-compliance within 12 months. First, increased emphasis was placed upon ensuring that DSE compliance supervisors had a heightened awareness of the districts that had need of technical assistance in order to correct non-compliance. An agenda item in daily staff meetings with DSE Compliance Supervisors addressed districts that were out of compliance, and the progress being made with those districts to correct their non-compliance. If a DSE supervisor encountered difficulty in providing the technical assistance to a district via phone or email, the RPDC compliance consultant assigned to the district was contacted and asked to make a personal visit to the district to provide assistance. The DSE will continue to discuss districts' success in correction of noncompliance in daily staff meetings and coordinate technical assistance to districts who are struggling to meet the 12 month timeline with compliance consultants.

In the 4th Cycle Monitoring training and other state-wide conferences such as the Special Education Administrator's Conference increased emphasis was placed upon state targets to ensure districts that were preparing for their MSIP review understood the importance placed upon meeting targets for students' performance. Fourth Cycle Monitoring training will maintain its focus upon the importance of correction of non-compliance.

Implement a regional support system: DESE has five regional compliance consultants across the state. These consultants work with districts that have remaining noncompliance as well as providing training and technical assistance on compliance standards and indicators to all districts.

Increased communication between DSE compliance supervisors and RPDC compliance consultants provided a stronger base for the regional support system for corrective action plans and improvement plans. Updates about the status of districts' correction of non-compliance was provided to RPDC consultants through meetings, email, and telephone. RPDC compliance consultants worked diligently with the DSE compliance supervisors to implement the new IMACS so that the evidence of correction of non-compliance could be submitted smoothly by districts. Missouri's DSE compliance staff will continue to implement this regional support system in order to provide assistance to districts.

Each district with identified noncompliance is assigned to a compliance consultant who assists the districts in correcting the noncompliance as soon as possible after the district receives the report, but in no case later than 12 months after the date of the report.

The DSE staff has found the regional support system to be very effective and will continue to implement it in the 2007-08 school year.

Contract for web-based monitoring management system: The contract for the web-based monitoring management system was completed.

Implement web-based system for monitoring and self-assessment purposes: The IMACS is the web-based monitoring management system used to monitor the districts' evidence of correction of non-compliance. The system is designed to provide timely feedback to districts as they provide documentation for evidence of correction to compliance supervisors. Daily staff meetings with compliance supervisors and weekly phone calls to the contracted company, Leader Services, has improved the implementation of IMACS and has increased its usability for districts. DSE staff will continue to work closely with Leader and districts to provide a comprehensive system to monitor correction of non-compliance.

Assign a staff person to coordinate follow-up reviews: The assistant director and data specialist of DSE compliance have worked closely to communicate to compliance supervisors when district timelines are approaching for correction of non-compliance in 12 months. This communication

and hard work has resulted in a significant increase in the percentage of districts who demonstrated correction of non-compliance within 12 months. The system we have put in place has been successful and we plan to continue this coordination of follow-up reviews.

Generate and review monthly reports of districts: The compliance data specialist generated regular data reports to track correction of non-compliance. These reports were used to evaluate the need for actions to be taken to ensure correction within 12 months. DSE staff found the generation of data reports to track correction of non-compliance effective and will continue to use these reports for that purpose.

IMACS will produce regular reports and reminders to both the Division and districts in regard to correction of noncompliance.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No revisions were made to the targets or improvement activities in the SPP

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the state.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = $[(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) \text{ divided by } 1.1] \text{ times } 100$.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	100% of complaints will be resolved within 60 day or extended timelines.

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

Missouri met the target of 100% of complaints resolved within 60 days or appropriately extended timelines.

Child Complaints

School Year	Total Child Complaints Filed	Total Reports Issued	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline with Appropriate Extensions	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline without Appropriate Extensions	Percent resolved within 60 day or extended timelines
2004-05	107	90	5	0	100.0%
2005-06	104	92	16	0	100.0%
2006-07	99	81	6	0	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

Missouri continues to maintain 100% compliance with this indicator.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Continue current procedures to maintain compliance with timelines
- Continue to conduct and analyze participant satisfaction/feedback surveys

Discussion of improvement activities follows:

Maintain compliance with timelines: DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for issuance of child complaints. Reports are monitored to ensure that appropriate extensions are made when necessary.

In September 2007, the DSE staff completed a web stream training to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system for child complaints.

Satisfaction/feedback surveys: Surveys are mailed to each individual who has filed a child complaint with the DSE. These surveys are used to analyze the process used when investigating child complaints and to report required data to OSEP. If after reviewing the data from the survey, DSE staff determines improvements can be made to the child complaint process, those improvements will be made. At this time the results of the surveys do not indicate areas for improvement.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No revisions made to targets or improvement activities in the State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	100% of due process hearings will be fully adjudicated within 45 day or appropriately extended timelines.

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

Missouri met the target of 100% of the due process hearings being fully adjudicated within 45 days or appropriately extended timelines.

Due Process Hearing Requests

School Year	Total Due Process Hearings Beyond Timeline without Extension	Percent Fully Adjudicated within 45 Days or Extended Timeline
2004-2005	0	100.0%
2005-2006	0	100.0%
2006-2007	0	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

Missouri continues to maintain 100% compliance with this indicator.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Continue current procedures to maintain compliance with timelines
- Continue to conduct and analyze participant satisfaction/feedback surveys

Discussion of improvement activities follows:

Maintain compliance with timelines: DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for due process hearings. Reports are monitored to ensure that appropriate extensions are made when necessary.

The DSE staff completed a web stream training to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system in September 2007 which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system for due process.

Satisfaction/feedback surveys: When a due process is withdrawn, surveys are mailed to each individual who has filed a due process with the DSE. These surveys are used to analyze the reasons for withdrawal of due process complaints and to report required data to OSEP. If after reviewing the data from the survey, DSE staff determines improvements can be made to the due process complaint process,

those improvements will be made. At this time the results of the surveys do not indicate areas for improvement

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No revisions to targets or improvement activities made to the State Performance Plan

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	50% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

Missouri did not meet the target of 50% established for the 2006-07 school year.

	2005-06	2006-07
Resolution Sessions	32	52
Settlement Agreements	15	24
Percent Settlement Agreements	46.9%	46.2%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

The comparison of 2005-06 to 2006-07 shows a slight decrease of less than one percent, from 46.9% to 46.2%, and the target for 2006-07 of 50% of hearings being resolved through settlement agreements was not met.

The DSE staff completed a web stream training to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system in September 2007. The training includes a description of the due process system, including resolution sessions.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

The SPP reflects changes to the targets for this indicator. Missouri is a state that has small numbers of mediation and resolution hearings; therefore, we feel that our baseline is not statistically significant. In addition, indicator 18 is not something over which we have control. We do not feel this is a meaningful indicator because it implies if resolution is not successful, some party has failed to perform well rather than accepting some issues must be heard in a hearing in order to be resolved. Since we do not feel this is a meaningful indicator, we believe our efforts need to instead focus upon things we can affect such as encouraging increased participation in resolution hearings. Finally, Missouri's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is supportive of this target revision, and passed a motion that specifically recommended lowering our target to 35%. The SEAP agrees that we should not focus upon the indicators we can not affect, and would like to see us focus our efforts on indicators that have a positive impact on students.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	62.5% of mediations will result in mediation agreements

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

Missouri did not meet the target 62.5% percent of mediations that resulted in mediation agreements. Data for 2006-07 show that 55.5% of mediations resulted in agreements.

	Mediation Agreements	Total Mediations Held	Percent with Agreements
2005-06	4	6	66.7%
2006-07	15	27	55.5%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

While the percentage of mediations held that resulted in an agreement decreased, the number of mediations increased significantly from the previous year. No changes were made regarding the mediation system other than technical assistance regarding the proposed and final federal regulations on dispute resolution.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Develop mediation survey and begin data collection

This activity was not completed and in reevaluating this indicator, we have removed it from the SPP. See justification below.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

The SPP reflects changes to the targets for this indicator. Missouri is a state that has small numbers of mediation and resolution hearings; therefore, we feel that our baseline is not statistically significant. In addition, indicator 19 is not something over which we have control. We do not feel this is a meaningful indicator because it implies if mediation is not successful, some party has failed to perform well rather than accepting some issues must be investigated as a child complaint or heard in a hearing in order to be resolved. Since we do not feel this is a meaningful indicator, we believe our efforts need to instead focus upon things we can affect such as encouraging increased participation in mediation. Finally, Missouri's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is supportive of this target revision, and passed a motion that specifically recommended lowering our target to 35%. The SEAP agrees that we should not

focus upon the indicators we can not affect, and would like to see us focus our efforts on indicators that have a positive impact on students.

The activity to develop a mediation survey has been removed from the SPP due to our emphasis on increasing the number of mediations in the state. Given the current limited number of mediations, it was determined that survey data on mediations would not provide meaningful information.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006-07**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and Annual Performance Report data, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006-07	100% of state reported data are timely and accurate

Actual Target Data for 2006-07:

Missouri's score of 99.1% did not meet the target of 100% compliance for the requirement to submit timely and accurate data.

Missouri utilizes a variety of data sources to compile data for the Annual Performance Report and the Section 618 data. Sources include the following:

- Core Data Collection System – Core Data is a web-based system used to collect data from districts. District-reported Core Data information are used for the Section 618 child count, placement, exiting, discipline and personnel reporting. Core Data is also used for APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 14
- Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) – MAP data are used by the Department for NCLB/AYP reporting and district accreditation purposes, among others. Pre-coding of student information and a demographic clean-up window ensures accurate information. MAP data is used for the Section 618 Assessment table and for APR Indicator 3
- IMACS – the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System is used to gather data through special education monitoring self-assessments. Data collected through IMACS and verified by desk review include Timelines for Part C to Part B Transition (APR 12), Evaluation Timelines (APR 11), Transition Plans (APR 13) and correction of noncompliance (APR 15).
- Dispute Resolution Database – the database is used to record information on child complaints, due process hearing requests, mediations and resolution sessions. The database is used to monitor timelines throughout the year, and data are used for the Section 618 Dispute Resolution table and for APR Indicators 15-19
- Other - The data collections for Early Childhood Outcomes (APR 7) and Parent Involvement (APR 8) are described in the respective SPP or APR sections.

Missouri utilized OSEP's scoring rubric to evaluate the accuracy and timeliness of data collected for 2006-07. The results are summarized below:

Percent of timely and accurate data for 2006-07

- APR
 - Valid and Reliable Data: 19/20 points
 - Correct Calculation: 18/18
 - Followed Instructions: 20/20
 - Timely Submission: 5/5
 - Total: 62/63 = 98.4%
- 618 State-Reported Data
 - Timely: 7/7 points
 - Complete data: 7/7
 - Passed edit checks: 7/7
 - Responded to Data Note Requests: 7/7
 - Total: 28/28 = 100%
- APR + 618 Total: $62 + (28 \times 2) = 118/119 = 99.1\%$

In short, state reported data for 2006-07 was submitted in a timely fashion and was accurate as defined by OSEP's scoring rubric. One point was deducted for the validity and reliability of dropout follow-up data in SPP Indicator 14.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

Missouri scored 99.1% compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate data for 2006-07.

The Division continues with data verification efforts as described in the SPP.

- The majority of data required by Section 618 of IDEA and data used for the SPP/APR are collected through the web-based Core Data Collection System. A manual with reporting instructions, and data edits are important features of the system. New special education directors are trained on the system each year, with on-going technical assistance provided by Division staff.
- Data editing and validation are handled by Division staff through a variety of means including year to year checks, additional data edits, reports to districts, etc. Any questionable elements are either verified as correct or are corrected by the districts.
- Extensive data profiles have been provided to districts for several years and are now also available to the public. These profiles, along with using the data for monitoring and district selection purposes, have ensured more accurate data collection and reporting.
- Staff in the Division serve as active members of the Department's Core Data Team, and thus have input into changes that may impact the special education data gathered and housed at the Department.
- An additional method of data verification has come about due to the selection of districts for monitoring and grant opportunities based on district performance data.
- Data gathered through IMACS all undergo verification by Compliance Supervisors, and the Supervisors' determinations supersede district responses if different

These efforts have allowed the Division to identify and correct many errors made by districts when submitting special education data. Due to this, many errors are corrected prior to federal data submissions.

Improvement activities for 2006-07 included the following:

- Access MOSIS/assessment pre-code data and compare to child count data
- Continue involvement with development of Missouri's Student Information System

- Work with State Supervisors of Instruction and district superintendents to discuss data accuracy and use
- Build data analysis into improvement planning process through a needs assessment.

MOSIS/child count comparison: The Department has used the Core Data Collection System for many years to collect student data for both disabled and nondisabled students. The Core Data System does not collect student level data. Over the past few years, the Department has been moving towards individual student data collection through the Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS). December 2007 was the first time that data will be collected in both aggregate (Core Data) and individual (MOSIS) formats. Comparisons are being made between the two systems in order to address common issues and questions across the state. It is anticipated that the Core Data System will no longer be used as a data collection tool beginning in the 2008-09 school year.

A preliminary comparison was made between the December 1, 2006, child count and a 2006-07 MOSIS submission used for statewide assessment pre-coding purposes. Since not all grade levels are tested and not all districts utilized the MOSIS pre-code submission, discrepancies were to be expected; however, when taking these known factors into consideration, the two data collections yielded comparable data overall.

Missouri's Student Information System (MOSIS): As noted above, the DESE and Division are continuing to move forward with student level data collection, and districts were able to submit student level data for the first time for end-of-year collections in summer 2007. During 2007-08, the student level collections will run concurrently with the existing aggregate collections so that results from the two collections can be compared and reliability/validity established. Division staff is part of a DESE workgroup that is identifying and defining the necessary data elements to be collected.

Work with State Supervisors of Instruction and district superintendents to discuss data accuracy and use: While discussions specific to this topic have not been held, the topic is embedded in most trainings and conversations that involve the special education system of general supervision. District and DESE personnel are aware that data are being used to trigger requirements for self-assessment purposes, select districts for on-site reviews, report to the public and provide local Determinations to districts, among other things. All of these endeavors have emphasized the importance of data accuracy.

Build data analysis into improvement planning process through a needs assessment: See the APR Overview regarding Improvement Planning (page 4). The first step in the improvement planning process is a data-based needs assessment. The training for the improvement plan includes information and examples of good needs assessment. The training stresses that accurate data is the basis for a good needs assessment, and that utilizing data to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses will, at times, result in uncovering inaccurate data. Therefore, training districts to conduct a data-based needs assessment will result in more accurate data. In addition, the scoring guide for the improvement plans provides points for the following:

- Methodology of drilldown process and data sources used are appropriate and described in sufficient detail
- Hypothesized root causes in needed areas of improvement are identified through data analysis
- The needs of the district are identified and prioritized through data analysis

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006-07:

No revisions were made to the targets or improvement activities in the SPP.